

REMARKS

It is apparent that the inclusion of the Section 102 rejection, based on Lam in paragraph 2, is a typographical error since paragraph 5 indicates that Lam does not explicitly teach a circuit to calculate a number of most significant bits to mask.

As amended, claim 13 calls for logic circuitry to take an absolute difference between data values by masking a number of most significant bits and a circuit to perform a calculation to determine the number of most significant bits to mask.

The cited reference to Lam, cited for the teaching of such a circuit, does not do a calculation to determine the number of most significant bits to mask. He just masks a set number. See column 7, lines 32-40. This point is made even more clearly in connection with the description of Figure 5, where it is explained that the two most significant bits are all that need be preserved in order to selectively scramble audio. Thus, no calculation is ever done, but, instead, all that is done is that all but the two most significant bits are masked.

What the claims call for is doing the calculation to determine which most significant bits to mask.

The office action indicates that claim 10, which recites the equation used in one embodiment to do the calculation, is patentable. But it is respectfully submitted that no one ever did a calculation to determine which most significant bits to mask in the course of taking an absolute difference. Therefore, the broader claims should also be patentable and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 26, 2009



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]
Attorneys for Intel Corporation